

Frascati Physics Series Vol. 000 (2001), pp. 000-000

TITLE CONFERENCE - Town, Date, 2001

LEPTONIC FLAVOR AND CP VIOLATION

Yuval Grossman

Department of Physics, Technion, Technion City, 32000 Haifa, Israel

ABSTRACT

We discuss how neutrino oscillation experiments can probe new sources of leptonic flavor and CP violation.

1 Introduction

The recent solar and atmospheric neutrino data provide very strong indications that the flavor structure of the leptons is similar to that of the quarks. Namely, that neutrinos are massive and that they mix. The details of the neutrino masses, mixing angles and CP violating phases are, however, yet to be determined.

We know quite well the quark masses and their mixing angles. We even know that the single phase of the CKM matrix is not zero, namely that CP

is violated in the quark sector. A great deal of effort is devoted not only to determining these flavor parameters, but also to searching for deviations from the Standard Model (SM). It is likely that other interactions, beside the weak interaction of the SM, also mediate flavor changing processes. Such new physics is searched for in two ways: 1) Searching for SM-forbidden (or practically undetectable) processes; and 2) looking for inconsistencies in the data, assuming they are described by the SM.

We know much less about the flavor parameters of the leptons. The next generation neutrino oscillation experiments are aimed for a better determination of these parameters. Of course, it is also very interesting to check whether the weak interaction is the only source of flavor and CP violation in the lepton sector. So far, this is done by searching for lepton flavor violating charged lepton decays like $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. In the SM with massive neutrinos, such decays are highly suppressed due to the small neutrino masses (the leptonic GIM mechanism). Such processes can be at the detectable level only in the presence of new physics.

As mentioned, new physics in the quark sector can also be searched for by looking for deviations from the SM predictions. It is interesting to ask whether this is also the situation with the leptons. As we explain below, the answer is yes.¹⁾ New neutrino interactions in the production and/or the detection processes can affect the SM¹ oscillation results in a detectable way.

In the following we explain this result. More details, with a complete set of references, can be found in ¹⁾.

2 Notations and Formalism

We start with a model-independent parameterization of new physics effects on production and detection processes in neutrino oscillation experiments. We denote by $|\nu_i\rangle$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, the three neutrino mass eigenstates. We denote by $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ the weak interaction partners of the charged lepton mass eigenstates α^- ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$):

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \sum_i U_{\alpha i} |\nu_i\rangle, \quad (1)$$

¹⁾From now on, our definition of the SM includes neutrino masses with mixing. By “new physics” we refer to models with extra sources of lepton flavor violation beside the weak interaction.

where U is the lepton mixing matrix. We consider new, possibly CP-violating, physics in the production and/or detection process.^{2, 1)} We parameterize the new physics interaction in the source and in the detector by two sets of effective four-fermion couplings, $(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{\alpha\beta}$ and $(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\alpha\beta}$, where $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$. Here $(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{\alpha\beta}$ refers to processes in the source where a ν_β is produced in conjunction with an incoming α^- or an outgoing α^+ charged lepton, while $(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\alpha\beta}$ refers to processes in the detector where an incoming ν_β produces an α^- charged lepton. New flavor violating interactions are those with $\alpha \neq \beta$. Phenomenological constraints imply that the new interaction is suppressed with respect to the weak interaction, $|(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{\alpha\beta}|, |(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\alpha\beta}| \ll G_F$.

For the sake of concreteness, we consider the production and detection processes that are relevant to neutrino factories. We therefore study an appearance experiment where neutrinos are produced in the process $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu_\alpha \bar{\nu}_{\alpha'}$ and detected by the process $\nu_\beta d \rightarrow \mu^- u$, and antineutrinos are produced and detected by the corresponding charge-conjugate processes. The relevant couplings are then $(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{e\beta}$ and $(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\mu\beta}$. It is convenient to define small dimensionless quantities $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{s,d}$ in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{e\beta}^s &\equiv \frac{(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{e\beta}}{\sqrt{|G_F + (G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{ee}|^2 + |(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{e\mu}|^2 + |(G_{\text{NP}}^s)_{e\tau}|^2}}, \\ \epsilon_{\mu\beta}^d &\equiv \frac{(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\mu\beta}}{\sqrt{|G_F + (G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\mu\mu}|^2 + |(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\mu e}|^2 + |(G_{\text{NP}}^d)_{\mu\tau}|^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Since we assume that $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^{s,d}| \ll 1$, we only evaluate their effects to leading order.

3 The Transition Probability in Vacuum

We denote by ν_e^s the state that is produced in the source in conjunction with an e^+ , and by ν_μ^d the state that is signaled by μ^- production in the detector:

$$|\nu_e^s\rangle = \sum_i [U_{ei} + \epsilon_{e\mu}^s U_{\mu i} + \epsilon_{e\tau}^s U_{\tau i}] |\nu_i\rangle, \quad |\nu_\mu^d\rangle = \sum_i [U_{\mu i} + \epsilon_{\mu e}^d U_{ei} + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^d U_{\tau i}] |\nu_i\rangle.$$

The transition probability $P_{e\mu} = |\langle \nu_\mu^d | \nu_e^s(t) \rangle|^2$, where $\nu_e^s(t)$ is the time-evolved state that was purely ν_e^s at time $t = 0$, is then

$$P_{e\mu} = \left| \sum_i e^{-iE_i t} [U_{ei} U_{\mu i}^* + \epsilon_{e\mu}^s |U_{\mu i}|^2 + \epsilon_{\mu e}^{d*} |U_{ei}|^2 + \epsilon_{e\tau}^s U_{\tau i} U_{\mu i}^* + \epsilon_{\mu\tau}^{d*} U_{\mu i} U_{\tau i}^*] \right|^2.$$

Our results will be given in terms of the following parameters

$$\Delta m_{ij}^2 \equiv m_i^2 - m_j^2, \quad \Delta_{ij} \equiv \Delta m_{ij}^2 / (2E), \quad x_{ij} \equiv \Delta_{ij} L / 2, \quad (3)$$

where E is the neutrino energy and L is the distance it travels.

To understand the essential features of our analysis, we start with a two generation example. It is instructive to work in the small x limit. Thus, we expand to second order in x and $\epsilon \equiv \epsilon_{\mu e}^{d*} + \epsilon_{e\mu}^s$. While here we treat both parameters as small, we keep in mind that in most experimental setups we expect $x \gg \epsilon$. We choose a basis where the mixing matrix is real and is parameterized by one angle θ . Then,

$$P_{e\mu} = x^2 \sin^2 2\theta - 2x \sin 2\theta \mathcal{I}m(\epsilon) + |\epsilon|^2. \quad (4)$$

The first term is the SM piece. The other two arises only in the presence of new physics. The last term, which is a direct new physics term, does not require oscillations and it is very small. The second term is the most interesting one for our purpose. It is an interference term between the direct new physics amplitude and the SM oscillation amplitude. There are two points to emphasize regarding this term:

(i) It is linear in ϵ , and thus larger than the direct new physics term: The interference increases the sensitivity to the new physics.

(ii) The interference is CP violating. This can be understood from the fact that it is linear in t , namely it is T odd. In order for it to be CPT even it must also be CP odd.

At this point it is instructive to draw an analogy to another case where the interference term is very important: The search for $D - \bar{D}$ mixing.³⁾ The experimental setup is such that a D meson of known flavor is produced and its flavor is subsequently tagged when it decays. Usually, the flavor tagging at the decay uses Cabbibo allowed decay modes, $D \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $\bar{D} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$. However, these final states can also be produced via double Cabbibo suppressed decays from the “wrong” flavor. Namely, a $K^+ \pi^-$ final state from an initial D state can be the result of flavor oscillation or direct, doubly Cabbibo suppressed decay. Working at times much shorter than the oscillation period, the probability to observe an initial D state decaying into the wrong flavor is given by³⁾

$$\frac{\Gamma[D(t) \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-]}{\Gamma[\bar{D}(t) \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-]} = \left[R^2 - x \mathcal{I}m \left(R \frac{q}{p} \right) \Gamma t + x^2 (\Gamma t)^2 \right], \quad (5)$$

where $R \equiv A(D \rightarrow K^+\pi^-)/A(D \rightarrow K^-\pi^+)$ is the double Cabibbo suppression ratio, q and p are the standard notations for meson mixing parameters, $x = \Delta m/\Gamma$, and Δm is the mass difference between the two mass eigenstates. For simplicity we neglected a possible strong phase difference between the two decay amplitudes and we set the width difference to zero. In the D system we expect $x \ll R$, hence, the advantage of the interference term is clear. Without it, the oscillation enter only at $O(x^2)$. Due to the interference the sensitivity to the oscillation increases since the oscillation signal shows up at $O(x)$. The oscillation term is searched for by studying the time dependence. The linear term can be extracted, and if it is non zero, it must be due to flavor oscillation. Note that the interference term requires CP violation. (In fact, in the D system the interference term can also be generated without CP violation due to strong phases or a width difference).

We now return to the neutrinos. Since the effect of the new physics is CP violating, we need to compare it to the SM CP violation effects. Since in the SM CP is violated only with at least three generations, we use the three generation formalism. The neutrino data imply that $|U_{e3}|$ and $\Delta m_{12}^2/\Delta m_{13}^2$ are small, so we expand $P_{e\mu}^{\text{SM}}$ to second order and $P_{e\mu}^{\text{NP}}$ to first order in $|U_{e3}|$ and Δm_{12}^2 . For simplicity, we only present the result in the $|x_{12}/x_{13}| \ll |U_{e3}|$ limit and to leading order in x_{13} . For the SM piece we obtain:

$$P_{e\mu}^{\text{SM}} = 4x_{31}^2 |U_{e3}|^2 |U_{\mu3}|^2 - 8x_{21}x_{31}^2 \text{Im}(U_{e2}U_{e3}^*U_{\mu2}^*U_{\mu3}). \quad (6)$$

The first term gives the well known transition probability in the approximation that $\Delta m_{12}^2 = 0$. The last term is a manifestation of the SM CP violation. For the new physics piece we obtain

$$P_{e\mu}^{\text{NP}} = -4x_{31} \text{Im} \left[U_{e3}^* U_{\mu3} \epsilon \right]. \quad (7)$$

To measure CP violation, one will need to compare the transition probability $P_{e\mu}$ to that of the CP-conjugate process, $P_{\bar{e}\bar{\mu}}$. CP transformation of the Lagrangian takes the elements of the mixing matrix and the ϵ -terms into their complex conjugates. It is then straightforward to obtain the transition probability for antineutrino oscillations. Our interest lies in the CP asymmetry, $A_{\text{CP}} = P_-/P_+$ where $P_{\pm} = P_{e\mu} \pm P_{\bar{e}\bar{\mu}}$. The CP conserving rate P_+ is dominated by the SM. It is given by $P_+ = 8x_{31}^2 |U_{e3}U_{\mu3}|^2$. As is well known, CP violation within the SM is suppressed by both the small mixing angle $|U_{e3}|$ and

the small mass-squared difference Δm_{12}^2 . For short distances ($x_{21}, x_{31} \ll 1$) it is further suppressed since the dependence of P_-^{SM} on the distance is L^3 . The new physics term does not suffer from the last two suppression factors. It does not require three generations and it has a different dependence on the distance, $P_-^{\text{NP}} \propto L$. We obtain the following asymmetries:

$$A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{SM}} = -2x_{21} \mathcal{I}m \left(\frac{U_{e2} U_{\mu 2}^*}{U_{e3} U_{\mu 3}^*} \right), \quad A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{NP}} = -\frac{1}{x_{31}} \mathcal{I}m \left(\frac{\epsilon}{U_{e3} U_{\mu 3}^*} \right). \quad (8)$$

The apparent divergence of $A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{NP}}$ for small L is only due to the approximations that we used. Specifically, there is an $\mathcal{O}(|\epsilon|^2)$ contribution to P_+ that is constant in L , namely $P_+ = \mathcal{O}(|\epsilon|^2)$ for $L \rightarrow 0$. In contrast, $P_- = 0$ in the $L \rightarrow 0$ limit to all orders in $|\epsilon|$.

Equation (8) leads to several interesting conclusions:

(i) It is possible that, in CP-violating observables, the new physics contributions compete with or even dominate over the SM ones in spite of the superweakness of the interactions ($|\epsilon| \ll 1$).

(ii) The different distance dependence of $A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{SM}}$ and $A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{NP}}$ will allow, in principle, an unambiguous distinction to be made between new physics contributions of the type described here and the contribution from lepton mixing.

(iii) The $1/L$ dependence of $A_{\text{CP}}^{\text{NP}}$ suggests that the optimal baseline to observe CP violation from new physics is shorter than the one optimized for the SM.

4 The Transition Probability in Matter

Since long-baseline experiments involve the propagation of neutrinos in the matter of Earth, it is important to understand matter effects on our results. For our purposes, it is sufficient to study the case of constant matter density. Then the matter contribution to the effective ν_e mass, $A = \sqrt{2} G_F N_e$, where N_e is the electron density, is constant.

One obtains the transition probability in matter by replacing the mass-squared differences Δ_{ij} and mixing angles $U_{\alpha i}$ with their effective values in matter, Δ_{ij}^m and $U_{\alpha i}^m$. To understand the matter effects, it is instructive to work with two generation and in the small x limit. Then,

$$x^m = \frac{B}{\Delta} x, \quad \sin 2\theta^m = \frac{\Delta}{B} \sin 2\theta, \quad (9)$$

where $B = \Delta_{31} - A$. From (4) it is clear that matter effects cancel at lowest order in x . Therefore, we need to work to one higher order in x , and we get

$$P^m = P^v(1 \pm O(x^2)), \quad (10)$$

where P^m (P^v) is the oscillation probability in matter (vacuum). Since matter in Earth is not CP symmetric, its effect enters the oscillation formula for neutrinos and antineutrinos with opposite signs. Therefore, unlike the case of vacuum oscillation, P_- will also get contributions from the CP conserving terms. Then, there will be contributions to A_{CP} even if there is no CP violation. In particular, fake asymmetry can be related to the real part of ϵ . We denote the matter-related contribution to P_- by $P_-^m \equiv P_-(A) - P_-(A=0)$. Since the leading contributions to P_+ are the same as in the vacuum case, we can similarly define the matter-related contribution to A_{CP} : $A_{CP}^m \equiv P_-^m/P_+$.

We present here results for three generation and in the small x_{31} limit and assuming $|x_{12}/x_{13}| \ll |U_{e3}|$. We obtain

$$(A_{CP}^m)^{\text{SM}} = \frac{2}{3}x_{31}^2 \left(\frac{A}{\Delta_{31}} \right), \quad (A_{CP}^m)^{\text{NP}} = \frac{A}{\Delta_{31}} \mathcal{Re} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\mu e}^{d*} - \epsilon_{e\mu}^s}{U_{e3}U_{\mu 3}^*} \right). \quad (11)$$

We would like to make a few comments regarding our results here:

(i) Each of the four contributions has a different dependence on the distance. In the short distance limit, we have

$$(A_{CP}^m)^{\text{SM}} \propto L^2, \quad A_{CP}^{\text{SM}} \propto L, \quad (A_{CP}^m)^{\text{NP}} \propto L^0, \quad A_{CP}^{\text{NP}} \propto 1/L. \quad (12)$$

One can in principle distinguish between the various contributions.

(ii) If the phases of the ϵ 's are of order 1, then the genuine CP asymmetry will be larger (at short distances) than the matter effect one.

(iii) The search for CP violation in neutrino oscillations will allow us to constrain both $\mathcal{Re}(\epsilon)$ and $\mathcal{Im}(\epsilon)$.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

Now we can estimate the expected sensitivity to the new physics parameters in future experiments and to compare it with the sensitivity from searches for flavor violating charged lepton decays. We also wish to study the expectations for the magnitudes and phases of the lepton violating parameters in models of new physics. These issues were studied in ¹⁾ where it was found that

(i) Roughly, it is expected that $\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon) \sim 10^{-5}$ and $\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon) \sim 10^{-4}$ can be probed in a future neutrino factory.

(ii) Different charged lepton decays probe $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^s|$ at the 10^{-3} to 10^{-6} level depending on α and β . In particular, $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^s|$, which is the relevant parameter for a neutrino factory experiment, is bounded to be smaller than 3×10^{-3} .

(iii) There exist new physics models that can accommodate or even predict $|\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}^s| \sim 10^{-3}$ with arbitrary phases.

Therefore, we learn that the possibility to measure new neutrino interactions through neutrino oscillation experiments is open. Conversely, such future experiments can improve the existing bounds on flavor changing neutrino interactions which, at present, come from rare charged lepton decays.

To conclude, leptonic flavor violation and CP violation sources beyond the weak interaction can be searched in two complementary ways. One way is by searching for lepton flavor violating charged lepton decays. The second way is with neutrino oscillation experiments. Charged lepton experiments are usually easier compared with neutrino ones. On the other hand, the effects of flavor violating in charged lepton decays are quadratic in the small lepton violating amplitude, while it is linear in oscillation experiments. Finally, charged lepton decays are sensitive only to the absolute value of the new physics amplitude. Oscillation experiments are sensitive to both the magnitude and the phase of the new amplitude. Therefore, it is clearly worthwhile to search for leptonic flavor and CP violation using both methods.

Acknowledgements

I thank M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, A. Gusso and Y. Nir for an enjoyable collaboration and A. Soffer for reading the manuscript.

References

1. M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, Y. Grossman, A. Gusso and Y. Nir, to appear in Phys. Rev. D [hep-ph/0105159] and work in progress.
2. Y. Grossman, Phys. Lett. B **359**, 141 (1995) [hep-ph/9507344].
3. See for example, S. Bergmann *et al*, Phys. Lett. B **486**, 418 (2000) [hep-ph/0005181].